



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,712	03/31/2000	DONALD H. RUBIN	01123.0004	8103

23859 7590 01/27/2004
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG, P.C.
SUITE 1000
999 PEACHTREE STREET
ATLANTA, GA 30309-3915

EXAMINER

FOLEY, SHANON A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1648

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/509,712

Applicant(s)

RUBIN ET AL.

Examiner

Shanon Foley

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23,25-29 and 32-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23 and 25-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 34-36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32,33,37,39,41 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 38,40,42 and 44 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

In paper no. 23, applicant added new claims 37-44. Claims 1-23, 25-29 and 32-44 are pending in the application. Claims 1-23 and 25-29 are withdrawn from consideration and claims 24, 30 and 31 have been cancelled. Claims 32-44 are under consideration.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 32 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,448,000 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the patent application and '000 is the use of serum to identify genes required for viral growth. This step, recited in the patent, is not patentably distinct from instant claim 32, which encompasses cells that are grown in any type of medium in order to identify genes that do not affect cell growth upon exogenous gene integration and viral infection. Therefore, instant claim 32 and claim 13 of '000 are not patentably distinct.

Claims 33, 37, 39, 41 and 43 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 13 of U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 1648

6,448,000. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are drawn to a method of screening a compound for antiviral activity or making an antiviral compound by transferring into a cell a gene identified as essential for viral growth, but unnecessary for the survival of the cell. These concepts are not patentably distinct from claim 13 of '000 because serum is identified as containing components required for viral growth, but not essential for cell survival in '000, see column 2, lines 40-55. It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have separated the components within serum to screen for and identify specific antiviral ingredients. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have had a reasonable expectation of success in screening and making antiviral ingredients with the method of '000 because the method uses antiviral factors, i.e. serum, that are required for viral propagation, but not essential for cellular survival. Therefore, claims 33, 37, 39, 41 and 43 are not patentably distinct from '000.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 34-36 are drawn to allowable subject matter. The prior art does not teach or suggest SEQ ID NO: 75. As discussed in the Office action mailed May 8, 2002, SEQ ID NO: 75 shares sequence identity with Dubois et al. (WO 99/19481-A2, 7/24/1999, ID NO: AAX57445). However, this reference is not a prior art reference. In addition, the prior art does not teach or suggest that this sequence is necessary for viral growth, but not necessary for the survival of a cell.

Art Unit: 1648

Claims 38, 40, 42 and 44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanon Foley whose telephone number is (703) 308-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on (703) 308-4027. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


Shanon Foley